



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/812,342

03/29/2004

Dong Tack Suh

51278/RAH/C1015

2547

23363

7590

08/14/2006

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP
PO BOX 7068
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068

EXAMINER

FERGUSON, MICHAEL P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3679

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/812,342

Applicant(s)

SUH, DONG TACK

Examiner

Michael P. Ferguson

Art Unit

3679

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: 1-12, 18, 19 and 38.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 13-17, 20, 21, 23-32 and 34-37.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.



DANIEL P. STODOLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Attorney's arguments in regards to the rejections of Konig & Meyer (DE 36 04 497) and Takayama (US 6,508,262) have been fully considered. However, after further consideration, the rejections as set forth in the previous office action are still believed to be proper.

As to claim 13, Attorney argues that:

Konig & Meyer does not disclose a pull pin assembly comprising a pull pin body integral with the main body and extending radially outward from the central hollow; a pull pin slidably disposed in the space of the pull pin body, the pull pin having a circumferential stop, wherein the circumferential stop is dimensioned to prevent the pull pin from passing completely through the first hole.

Examiner disagrees. As to claims 13 and 28, Konig & Meyer discloses a pull pin assembly comprising a pull pin body (A) integral with the main body (11) and extending radially outward from the central hollow (relative to the countersunk recess); a pull pin slidably disposed in the space of the pull pin body (pull pin (13) slides within the hollow of pull pin body (A)), the pull pin having a circumferential stop (B), wherein the circumferential stop is dimensioned (designed of a length where stop B can not extend completely through the first hole) to prevent the pull pin from passing completely through the first hole (Figure 3).

As to claim 20, Attorney argues that:

Konig & Meyer does not disclose a pull pin assembly wherein the main body is fixed against movement along the first rod or pole when the pull pin is in the second position.

Examiner disagrees. As to claim 20, Konig & Meyer discloses a pull pin assembly wherein the main body (11) is fixed against movement along the first rod or pole (1) when the pull pin (13) is in the second position (inherently, friction acts between the main body (11) and first rod (1); Figure 3).

As to claim 37, Attorney argues that:

Konig & Meyer does not disclose a pull pin assembly comprising a main body having a central hollow dimensioned to contain the first rod or pole, the main body extending around and abutting the end of the first rod or pole.

Examiner disagrees. As to claim 37, Konig & Meyer does not disclose a pull pin assembly comprising a main body (11) having a central hollow dimensioned to contain the first rod or pole (1), the main body extending around and abutting the end of the first rod or pole (via intermediate elements (22,29) contained within main body (11); Figure 3).

As to claims 13,20,28 and 37, Attorney argues that:

Takayama does not disclose a pull pin assembly comprising a biasing member biasing the pull pin (30) toward the first position to relatively lock the first rod or pole and the second rod or pole when the first hole is superimposed on the second hole, wherein the main body is fixed against movement along the first rod or pole when the pull pin is in the second position.

Examiner disagrees. As to claims 13,20,28 and 37, Takayama discloses a pull pin assembly comprising a biasing member (31) biasing the pull pin (30) toward the first position to relatively lock the first rod or pole (11,12,18) and the second rod or pole (10) when the first hole is superimposed on the second hole (first rod element (18) superimposed on second rod (10)), wherein the main body (5) is fixed against movement (via friction) along the first rod or pole when the pull pin is in the second position (Figure 3).

As to claim 37, Attorney argues that:

Takayama does not disclose a pull pin assembly comprising a main body having a central hollow dimensioned to contain the first rod or pole, the main body extending around the end of the first rod or pole.

Examiner disagrees. As to claim 37, Takayama discloses a pull pin assembly comprising a main body (5) having a central hollow dimensioned to contain the first rod or pole (11), the main body extending around the end of the first rod or pole (Figure 3).